

Remarks


Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 7-9, 15, 19, and 22 have been amended in various particulars as indicated hereinabove. New Claims 23-38 have been added to alternatively define the invention.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for having insufficient antecedent basis for a limitation. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-7, 10 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schwarte (WO98/10255, noting that US 6,825,455 is being used as a translation for WO98/10255). In related rejections, claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwarte (WO98/10255); and claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwarte (WO98/10255) in view of Meynarts (US 7,268,815).


These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The Schwarte documents describe a conventional electrode relationship. Specifically, they teach the use of three electrodes to create the potential gradient in the photosensitive area to transport charges laterally out of the photosensitive area. A portion of Schwarte's Fig. 13 is included and annotated below;




This portion of Fig. 13 shows the photosensitive area and the three electrodes or photogates G_{am} , G_0 , and G_{bm} .

Fig 1 from the instant application illustrates one embodiment of the present invention. Of note is the fact that an electrode E, formed as a layer of transparent resistive material on the insulating layer O, extends across a photosensitive part of the image sensor element. The following is a portion of Fig. 1 of the present application:



This difference between relative to the Schwarte system is manifest in the pending claims. Claim 1, for example requires the transparent resistive material that extends across a photosensitive part of the image sensor element. In contradistinction, the Schwarte references to not suggest this claimed configuration and thus would not achieve the improve potential distribution across the photosensitive area. Instead the Schwarte system produces a more the stair-like distribution as illustrated in the following portion of Fig. 13 from the Schwarte patent:



For these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Application No.: 10/518,963
Amendment dated: March 11, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 11, 2007
Attorney Docket No.: 0154.0312US1

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By /grant houston/
J. Grant Houston
Registration No.: 35,900
Tel.: 781 863 9991
Fax: 781 863 9931

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421
Date: March 11, 2008